

SLAV 740: Bibliography and Methods  
 Line number: 43501  
 Time: MW, 8:00-9:15  
 Place: Parker Library, Slavic Dept.

Professor E. W. Clowes  
 Office: 2140 Wescoe  
 Office hours: MW, 9:30-10:30  
 and by appointment  
 Telephone: 864-2359, 864-4236  
 Email: eclowes@ku.edu

This course introduces Slavic graduate students to current methodologies used to conduct research in the field of literary studies, focusing also on Slavic contributions to theory and criticism. Among the broader, contextual questions considered are: What are the humanities and what place does the study of literature have in it? What is literary research and what are the goals of literary research?

SLAV 740 has a number of practical goals. Graduate students learn and apply both bibliographic and interpretive tools necessary for doing original literary research. Our chief goals are:

- to understand what literary research is—its goals, its scope, its key questions
- to learn and use the many sources of information about literature and literary scholarship
- to learn to judge the quality and reliability of information
- to identify the prejudices and agenda of a critic/ literary historian
- to identify and learn to construct the crucial parts of a scholarly essay
- to gain control of basic literary theoretical concepts and vocabulary
- to take the first steps in learning to apply theoretical concepts in the process of building an effective and convincing literary interpretation
- to experience and to write in the basic genres of literary profession, including: book review, annotated bibliography, bibliographic essay, conference abstract, limited research proposal.

Books and materials:

A flash drive that you bring to class

Either Chicago Manual of Style or MLA Style Handbook (both are available at the Parker Library in the Slavic Department)

Primary works (if at all possible, please read these works through once before the beginning of the semester; be thoroughly familiar with them by **September 22**):

Tolstoi, L. N. “Крейцера соната,”

<http://www.kulichki.com/inkwell/text/hudlit/classic/tolstoj/sonata.htm>

Chekhov, A. P. “Дама с собачкой,” <http://lib.ru/LITRA/CHEHOW/d.txt>

Bunin, I. A. “Солнечный удар,” <http://ilibrary.ru/text/1020/p.1/index.html>

Tolstaia, T. N. “Любовь и море,” <http://crimeaveb.narod.ru/Proza/Tolstaya1.html>

Secondary works (available at the KU Union Bookstore):

Bakhtin, Mikhail. The Dialogic Imagination. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982. ISBN 029271534X

Booth, Wayne, et al. The Craft of Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. ISBN 978-0226065847

- Clark, Katerina. The Soviet Novel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003. ISBN 978-0253213679
- Lotman, Yuri. Universe of the Mind. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001. ISBN 978-0253214058
- Propp, Vladimir. The Morphology of the Folktale. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968. ISBN 978-0292783768
- Ram, Harsha. The Imperial Sublime. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006. ISBN 978-0299181949
- Selden, Raman, et al., eds. A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory, 4<sup>th</sup> edition. London: Prentice-Hall, 1997. ISBN 0-13-491952-1
- Selden, Raman, ed. The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: From Formalism to Poststructuralism. Vol. 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. ISBN 0-521-31724-x

Available on Reserve Shelf at Parker Slavic Library:  
Chicago Manual of Style and MLA Style Handbook  
Other volumes of literary theory

Blackboard:  
Syllabus  
Extra readings on a number of approaches to literature

We will be using random numbers of Slavic and East European Journal, Russian Review, and Slavic Review for examples of successful book reviewing technique.

## OVERVIEW OF ORAL AND WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS:

### Oral presentations in this seminar include:

1. Brief weekly reports on the written project you are currently working on.
2. A longer presentation with hand-out on one theoretical approach (see #9 below).
3. Editorial discussions of student book reviews, annotated bibliographies, bibliographical essays, and abstracts.
4. Group discussion on constructing a grant proposal.
5. **September 22:** discussion of assigned primary works (Tolstoi, Chekhov, Bunin, Tolstaia)

### Writing assignments in this seminar are oriented toward the basic academic genres commonly used in literary research:

1. **Due September 3:** Identify one work of a Slavic literature that you would like investigate this semester and list all the editions and English translations of that work available in Watson. Write annotations determining which four are the major editions, of those which is the best edition, and why; and which are the two best translation and why.
2. **Due September 22:** Make a **bibliography of all archival funds** for that author that you can find in available archives.
3. **Due September 28:** Write a **full book review** on one recent book in your annotated bibliography (about 500 words). Email me your book review by 5 p.m., September 28. I will forward a copy to all students. On Sept. 29 hand in a copy of the book you reviewed.
4. **Due October 6:** Hand in the working title for your annotated bibliography on the author/work/ theme/question that you will investigate for the rest of the semester. Hand in at least **seven** annotations on secondary sources.
5. **Due October 27:** Hand in **full annotated bibliography** (4 major editions and the two best translations (if they exist) of your primary source; at least 1-2 archival sources; at least 25 secondary sources in your Slavic language, English, and any other language you can read).
6. **Due November 10:** Hand in **rough draft of bibliographic essay** on your topic. By discussing what questions have been asked and evaluating the existing answers, open up an unexplored and interesting, relevant research question. Make sure you have engaged both the major commentary specific to your author and, to the extent that you can, relevant “metadiscourses” or theoretical approaches.
7. **Due November 24:** Hand in **final draft of bibliographic essay** (about 2500 words).
8. **Due December 1:** Working from your bibliographic essay, design an **abstract** for a conference paper (not more than 200 words).

9. No specific date: choose one of the approaches that most interests you and present a hand-out with key words, concepts, and their definitions, supported with relevant quotes.
10. For discussion at the end of the semester: sources of funding in the humanities and social sciences and basic considerations in writing a **grant proposal**.

## SYLLABUS

### PART I (Weeks 1-4): Developing research tools for gathering and assessing information

**A. Using library resources:** work with Mr. Jon Giullian ([giullian@ku.edu](mailto:giullian@ku.edu)) on resources available in Watson Library and through the library website, and Ms. Sally Haines ([shaines@ku.edu](mailto:shaines@ku.edu)) at the Spencer Research Library

**B. Other sources of information:**

1. Sources in secondary texts: footnotes, bibliographies in articles and books; book reviews
2. Hard-copy bibliographical sources: examples useful for the Soviet era: Letopis' gazetnykh statei, Letopis' zhurnal'nykh statei, Knizhnyi ezhenedel'nik, relevant encyclopedias
3. Internet sources: East View, MLA, WorldCat, interlibrary loan through KU Libraries
4. Archives: Grimstead, internet information on Slavic literature and culture archives

**C. Final project for Part I:** Create an **annotated bibliography** with at least the 4 best editions of your chosen work, Russian, Czech, Croatian, or other archives for your author, 2 best translations, and at least 25 scholarly secondary sources. For each entry write three sentences summarizing its theme, scope, and approach, what new information it adds to the conversation about your subject of research, and note any agenda or prejudice of the author. (For more detail on writing a useful annotation, see the “Guidelines” at the end of this syllabus.)

Write a **bibliographical essay** in which you discern the main themes, theoretical approaches, and critical positions in the scholarly “conversation” about your work. Decide which are the strongest and weakest sources, and say why. Conclude with a discussion of relevant questions open to investigation.

Note: While evaluating the quality of the information you are finding, here are some questions to ask of all secondary, critical texts you read: Publication venue? Goal and agenda of author? Prejudices? Conceptual approach? Research languages used? Sources of information? Reliability of those sources?

### Day-by-Day Program for Part I

1. Monday, August 25: orientation to SLAV 740, library search pre-assessment  
Assignment for Aug. 27: **Choose the author and work** you would like to explore this semester. During the library sessions you will be working on your particular author and work—collecting relevant materials for your annotated bibliography, gaining a perspective on the crucial lines of argument in the critical commentary, and narrowing down a topic and research question that you want to investigate. Please bring your **flash drive** to all library sessions.  
**Start reading Booth et al., The Craft of Research. Read Ch. 1-5 carefully.**

2. Wednesday, August 27: Watson Library, rm. 419. Mr. Jon Giullian will give an introduction to the library website, reference collection, library stacks.  
Assignment for Sept. 3: **Skim Booth** et al., The Craft of Research. Read Ch. 1-5 carefully.

NO CLASS Monday, September 1, Labor Day

3. Wednesday, September 3: find all primary sources both in the original and in English translation for your chosen work available at KU libraries. Today we will spend 25 minutes in class discussing the primary sources you have found for your particular work, their relative advantages and disadvantages. We will spend 40 minutes at the Spencer Research Library, learning from Ms. Sally Haines about available rare Slavic sources at KU. Do not bring backpacks.  
Assignment for September 8: 1) Identify 5-7 secondary sources for your project.  
2) Read article: Caryl Emerson, "Grinev's Dream: The Captain's Daughter and a Father's Blessing," Slavic Review, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring, 1981), 60-76 (**Jstor**). Try to be aware of how Emerson constructs arguments and what makes them convincing.
4. Monday, September 8: structural reading of an academic article—title (epigraph), hook, hypothesis, contextualization (historical, cultural, critical, theoretical background), discussion of relevant secondary bibliography, construction of points, use of evidence, conclusion.
5. Wednesday, September 10: Watson Library, rm. 419. Work with Jon Giullian on main on-line humanities databases. For this day, email me three annotations, so I can check for any problems as you work along.  
Assignment for September 15: I will lend you copies of the three main American Slavic journals. Look through the reviews of books on literature and culture (for contrast you might read one review each of a historical and a social science book). Note which are more useful and why.
6. Monday, September 15: **Book reviews**, how to evaluate them and how to write them. We will study the back section of some numbers of Slavic Review, Slavic and East European Journal, and Russian Review and discuss the most useful kinds of book review.  
Note: your own book review is due **September 28, 5 p.m.** Please send me an electronic copy and I will distribute to everyone in the class.
7. Wednesday, September 17: Watson Library, rm. 419. Archives. Russian-only sources. Other Slavic sources.  
Assignment for September 22: **Hand in** a full bibliography of all archives on your author. Read primary works (Tolstoi, Chekhov, Bunin, Tolstaia) thoroughly and carefully.

**PART II (Weeks 5-12): Developing interpretive tools: current issues and concepts, understanding their history, and learning to relate them to the literary text to build an interpretation.**

**A. Two mantras of successful, interesting literary interpretation:**

1. **Read accurately and completely:** be rigorously true to the text (whether primary or secondary), which means—quote accurately, be aware of the context of the quoted material, be aware of the author’s intention and agenda, the various poetic and discursive structures of the text, the intended reader. This rule is particularly important when you are emotionally involved with the text—either agreeing or disagreeing. Being rigorous does not mean necessarily agreeing or disagreeing. There is lots of room for polemic, just base it on one accurate reading!
2. **Construct meaningful context:** a well-informed, stimulating context is essential for building an interesting interpretation. If your interpretation is placed in a well-researched and appropriate literary-critical, theoretical, historical, social, and/or cultural context, it is much more likely to be important to other researchers in the field in which you are doing research.

**B. Interpretive project:**

**1. Preparatory materials:**

- a) One or two accessible histories of literary criticism and interpretive approaches: for Fall, 2008. Raman Selden, ed. The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, vol. 8, and Raman Selden, et al., eds. A Reader’s Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory.
- b) Read current articles applying each interpretive approach.
- c) Read literary works that will allow us to apply these approaches. In Fall, 2008, we will use L. N. Tolstoi’s “Крейцерова соната,” A. P. Chekhov’s “Дама с собачкой,” I. Bunin’s “Солнечный удар” and T. Tolstaia’s essay, “Любовь и море.”

**2. Goals of this part of the course:**

- a) Understand what a literary interpretation is and what it can achieve.
- b) Internalize a brief history of criticism: use Jakobson’s model of communication to define the emphasis of each of the main approaches, formalism/ new criticism; structuralism/ semiotics; hermeneutics/reader response; literary history; psychoanalysis; gender criticism; sociology of literature; cultural studies. (Postmodernism, postsocialism, and postcolonialism will be treated in other courses.)
- c) Start to develop a second sense about the applicability of a given concept for building an interpretation.

**3. Our procedure:**

- a) Read history of criticism and in your notes define each theoretical approach and its central concepts. Restate the core questions implicit in each approach, find (good, useful, interesting) commentary using these approaches, and figure out how to ask those questions of our chosen Russian works and arrive at an interpretation.
- b) As you read, write for yourself an outline of each approach, one page maximum, in which you define each **key term**. Also note classical applications of that approach that are cited in the history. As you read, **search yourself** for your own literary-critical interests: which approaches intrigue you? Which approaches seem to be applicable to the works of literature, which do you like best (in your experience so far)?

- c) As you read current applications, note the literary work(s) chosen for analysis, summarize briefly the insights gained from this analysis, note works cited, find key points in the structure of the argument (title, hook, introduction, framing/ context, main points, support for each point, conclusion(s)), footnotes, bibliography, languages used. Note what techniques are used to persuade you of the truth of the argument, e.g. “objectivity,” author’s awareness of whatever agenda or prejudice on their part; accurate, rigorous textual quotation and respect for the text, clarity of stated points, sensitivity to the appropriateness of the theoretical framework vis-à-vis the literary or cultural text, the theory’s weaknesses as well as its strengths. This kind of reading is a good exercise for learning to write effective academic prose.
- d) Figure out whether each approach opens new insights into our primary texts and, if so, how to apply it.
- e) Keep track of the different interpretations of our primary texts that we come up with and whether they contradict or support one another.

### C. Day-by-Day Program for Part II:

- 8. Monday, September 22: **Bibliography of archival works is due.** Discussion of primary works.  
**Formalism:** literariness; story vs. plot; defamiliarization; device  
Selden, Reader’s Guide, 29-45.
- 9. Wednesday, September 24:  
Discussion of Peter Steiner, “Russian Formalism,” in Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, vol. 8.  
Discussion of original critical works: Viktor Shklovskii, “Art as Technique.” Literary Theory: An Anthology. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 1998 (**Parker Library**, also available in Russian at Watson).
- 10. Monday, September 29: **Book review is due.** Book review discussion.  
Discussion of original critical works:  
Svetlana Boym, “Estrangement as a Lifestyle: Shklovsky and Brodsky,” Poetics Today, 17:4 (Winter, 1996), 511-530 (**Jstor**).  
Applicability of formalism to our primary works?
- 11. Wednesday, October 1:  
**Structuralism:** dominant, deep plot structure, narratology  
Selden, Reader’s Guide, 66-87.  
Dolozel and Attridge chapters in Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, vol. 8.
- 12. Monday, October 6: **Working title and annotation check is due.**  
Vladimir Propp, Morphology of the Folk Tale.  
Katerina Clark, The Soviet Novel, introduction, Ch. 7 (“The Prototypical Plot”), Appendix A.

13. Wednesday, October 8: Applicability of structuralism to our primary works?  
**Semiotics:** semiosis, semiosphere  
 Bann chapter in Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, vol. 8.
14. Monday, October 13: Yuri M. Lotman, Universe of the Mind, preface, ch. 8-12.  
 Stephen Hutchings, “Plotting against Abstraction in Russian Literature’s Provincial Hell: Fedor Sologub’s Aesthetics of Embodiment,” The Modern Language Review, Vol. 91, No. 3 (July, 1996), pp. 655-676 (**Jstor**).
15. Wednesday, October 15: Applicability of semiotics to our primary works?
16. Monday, October 20:  
**Reader response, literary history, and reception:** Tynianov and parody; intended/ implied reader/ reader in the text; reader response  
 Selden, Reader’s Guide, 47-65.  
 Holub chapters (9-11, focus on 11) in Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, vol. 8
17. Wednesday, October 22: : [http://az.lib.ru/t/tytjanow\\_j\\_n/text\\_01015.shtml](http://az.lib.ru/t/tytjanow_j_n/text_01015.shtml).  
 Bakhtin, “From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse,” The Dialogic Imagination, 41-83.
18. Monday, October 27: **Full annotated bibliography is due.**  
 Carol Avins “Reaching a Reader: The Master’s Audience in The Master and Margarita,” Slavic Review, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Summer, 1986), pp. 272-285 (**JStor**).  
 Joanna Kot, “Manipulating Distance in Zinaida Gippius’ Drama Holy Blood: A Well-Balanced Experiment,” The Slavic and East European Journal, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Winter, 1996), pp. 649-666 (**JStor**).  
 Applicability of theories of literary history and reception to our primary works?
19. Wednesday, October 29:  
**Psychoanalytical approaches to literature:** Selden, Reader’s Guide, skim 150-200; Britton chapter in Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, vol. 8, 197-221.
20. Monday, November 3: Gary Rosenshield, “Freud, Lacan, and Romantic Psychoanalysis: Three Psychoanalytic Approaches to Madness in Pushkin’s The Queen of Spades” (**JStor**).  
 Psychoanalysis and our primary works?
21. Wednesday, November 5:  
**Sociology of literature:** sociology of writing; Marxism; ideology  
 Selden, Reader’s Guide, 88-120.  
 Britton chapter in Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, vol. 8, 221-252.
22. Monday, November 10: **Rough draft of bibliographical essay is due.** Please send a copy to me by 8 a.m., Nov. 10. I will distribute to everyone in the class.  
 Readings in Rivkin and Ryan.

William Todd, Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin, Chapters 1-2 (**blackboard**).

23. Wednesday, November 12: Discussion of rough drafts.  
Discussion of sociology of literature and our primary works
24. Monday, November 17: Literature faculty roundtable

### **PART III (Weeks 13-15)**

**Designing a limited research project, writing a proposal (abstract) on it for a conference paper, first steps in designing a grant proposal:**

**A. Invite SLL literature professors** to do a 30-minute presentation each on their research, their chosen research approaches, a brief statement of what each has added to knowledge of our field in their research careers. Questions to address: what do you see as the “hottest” area in our field? Summarize the focus of your research program. What are your main research questions? How did you get interested in that area? How do you design your research topics? Each professor will assign a short reading from their research.

**B. Identify a Russian work or works** to which one might usefully apply one of the approaches and concepts studied above, justify your supposition. Think about what other kinds of information you would need to carry out a good application, e.g. for sociology of literature you would need broad historical, technological (?), and social information about the whole nexus of writing culture—writers, publishers, critics, and readers. Think about finding the theoretical, historical, or cultural framework that makes what you have to say fascinating to your reader (for the question about your intended reader see the next section).

**C. Final course project: Design a proposal for a conference paper**, in which you describe a topic and a research question you are asking about it, the textual materials you are interpreting, your application of a relevant interpretive approach, and what your work is adding to what we already know about the subject.

**D. Final week of class: evaluation of conference abstracts** and thinking about how to write a **grant proposal**. The class becomes the vetting committee for the mock abstracts. Each student receives a referee’s check sheet and writes comments about the following categories:

1. the value and interest of the research question (the overall project);
2. the appropriateness of the theoretical approach to the primary material, any particular weaknesses that require modification;
3. the future ability of the primary investigator to complete the project; the accuracy of their self-assessment.

### **Day-by-day plan for Part III:**

25. Wednesday, November 19: Literature faculty roundtable? (I will be out of town—SUNY Binghamton talk, AAASS)
26. Monday, November 24: **Final draft of bibliographical essay is due.**

- Gender criticism:** sexuality, gender, essentialism, queer theory  
Selden, Reader's Guide, 121-149, 243-266.
27. Monday, December 1: **Send copy of abstract to me, and I will distribute it.**  
Sibelan Forrester, "Bells and Cupolas: The Formative Role of the Female Body in Marina Tsvetaeva's Poetry," Slavic Review, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Summer, 1992), pp. 232-246 (**JStor**).
28. Wednesday, December 3: Panel discussion of abstracts.  
Assignment for Dec. 8: Read relevant parts of Ram, The Imperial Sublime. Note key organizing features—hook, hypothesis (what is new), approach, critical context, conclusion (how did it differ from the hypothesis), major printed and archival sources, one-sentence outline of each of main chapters, contribution of this work to the humanities, intended readership.
29. Monday, December 8: Designing a research grant. Sources of research funding.  
Planning a book-length project: discussion of The Imperial Sublime.
30. Wednesday, December 10: More on grants. Conclusions and further development.

If there is time, we will discuss how to design a limited research project, in which you could apply your chosen approach. This project is designed to stimulate your thinking about questions that you need to answer in order to conduct successful research. You will need to include:

- a) a brief description of the project, what questions you are asking and what you hope to find out (i.e. a hypothesis if you have one), the primary material (i.e. literary or other cultural texts) you intend to analyze;
- b) a brief statement of your theoretical approach and brief bibliographical presentation on what has already been achieved in this area and what you intend to add to existing knowledge;
- c) a list of the types of information you need to obtain in order to complete your project and where you will find them (Can you find everything you need at KU? What is on the internet? Do you need to visit another library or archive?);
- d) your language skills (Do you have the language skills to complete this project? If not, what do you propose to do in order to reach the level of language proficiency to do the work you have proposed?);
- e) your intended reader (To whom are you speaking in this research project? With whom do you intend to share your findings? An elementary or middle school literature class? A high school literature class? An undergraduate college class? A graduate class? The general educated adult reader?);
- f) bibliography and brief bibliographical discussion.

### Guidelines for Creating an Annotated Bibliography

When you compile a bibliography of secondary literature, that is, research already done on your literary subject, you are taking the first step to adding to what we know about that subject. You are finding out and summarizing as thoroughly as you can what has already been achieved and what the community of literary historians and critics already knows about that subject.

The bibliographical entry should give the following information:

1. author—last name first
2. full title of the article or book
3. place of publication
4. name of the publisher
5. date of publication

For more information on correct punctuation, consult the MLA Style Sheet or the Chicago Book of Style, both of which are in Watson Library or Parker Library.

The purpose of annotations: annotations are your first notes on these research articles and books. They should help you remember the crucial points of a work of research, which are listed below:

1. The theme of the research
2. The key research question
3. The “primary” material on which the research is performed, e.g. work/s of literature, letters, diaries, media reviews, memoirs, readers’ responses, etc.
4. The agenda of the researcher, e.g. are they carrying on a dispute with other scholar/s? with whom? Do they have a relevant like or dislike or other prejudice that comes through in their argument?
5. Relevant dates and places that create any prejudices or “slant” in terms of agenda, methodological approach or conclusion regarding the literary works studied?
6. How thorough is the author’s familiarity with other secondary sources (research, history, criticism) in all languages? Are they “reinventing the wheel”?
7. And the crucial bit of information: what is the **new knowledge** contributed in this piece of research? (in other words, why should you bother annotating it?)

Sources for creating your annotated bibliography (also, consult Slavic librarian, Mr. Jon Giullian, for further questions; his email is: giullian@ku.edu):

KU online catalogue

Worldcat

MLA (Modern Language Association)

Electronic data bases, such as East View, J-Stor

New York Public Library Catalogue

Letopis’ zhurnal’nykh statei (covers more journals than East View carries)

Letopis’ gazetnykh statei (covers more newspapers than East View carries)

On-line Russian archives

Bibliographic management software, e.g. RefWorks or EndNote

**Do not use Wikipedia in your annotated bibliography.**

## Library of Congress transcription of Russian letters (Cyrillic) into the Latin alphabet

Cyrillic letters	Latin letters	Cyrillic	Latin
А а	a	П п	p
Б б	b	Р р	r
В в	v	С с	s
Г г	g	Т т	t
Д д	d	У у	u
Е е	e	Ф ф	f
Ё ё	ë	Х х	kh
Ж ж	zh	Ц ц	ts
З з	z	Ч ч	ch
И и	i	Ш ш	sh
Й й	i	Щ щ	shch
К к	k	Ъ ъ	"
Л л	l	Ы ы	y
М м	m	Ь ь	'
Н н	n	Э э	e
О о	o	Ю ю	iu
		Я я	ia